		Case 3:09-cv-00986-JAH -WMC Docume	ent 7 Filed 05/27/09 Page 1 of 12				
600 101	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	KLINEDINST PC 501 West Broadway, Suite 600 San Diego, California 92101 (619) 239-8131/FAX (619) 238-8707 hrosing@klinedinstlaw.com Attorneys for Defendant THE NATH LAW GROUP and ROBERT P. COGAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
	10	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
C STE. (IA 921	11	NEUROREPAIR, INC.,	Case No. 09 CV 986 JAH NLS				
KLINEDINST PC 501 WEST BROADWAY, STE. SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92	12	Plaintiff,	ANSWER OF DEFENDANTS THE NATH				
<pre> ⟨LINED T BRO/ SO, CAL </pre>	13	v.	LAW GROUP AND ROBERT P. COGAN TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT				
1 Wes N DIEG	14	THE NATH LAW GROUP, a Professional Limited Liability	[JURY TRIAL DEMANDED]				
50 SA	15	Corporation, ROBERT P. COGAN, an individual, and DOES 1-20,	Courtroom: 11				
	16	Defendants.	Judge: Hon. John A. Houston Magistrate Judge: Hon. Nita L. Stormes				
	17		Complaint Filed: Trial Date: None set				
	18						
	19 20						
	21	COME NOW Defendants The Nath Law Group and Robert P. Cogan ("Defendants") through their respective counsel, and admit, deny, and allege as to each paragraph of the					
	22	Original Complaint as follows:					
	23	SPECIFIC ADMISSIONS AND DENIALS					
	24	1. Defendants admit these allegations.					
	25	2. Defendants admit these allegations.					
	26	3. Defendants admit that the website, <u>www.nathlaw.com</u> , proffers the					
	27	statements contained in this paragraph, but denies the remainder of this paragraph.					
	28						
			- 1 - 09 CV 986 JAH NLS				
		11	U) CV 900 JAH NLS				

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 4. Defendants admit these allegations but deny that the California State Courts have jurisdiction over this matter as it arises from certain patent-related matters.
- 5. Defendants admit the allegations of this paragraph, except that Defendants deny that Robert P. Cogan "represented that he specializes in legal matters relating or pertaining to intellectual property" and that "Cogan does not have any background or training in the biological sciences in general, or in neurobiology or neuroscience in particular."
- 6. As this paragraph does not set forth any material factual allegations, Defendants can neither admit nor deny these allegations.
- 7. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and, on that basis, deny the allegations of this paragraph.
 - 8. Defendants deny these allegations.
- 9. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and, on that basis, deny the allegations of this paragraph.
- 10. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and, on that basis, deny the allegations of this paragraph.
- 11. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and, on that basis, deny the allegations of this paragraph. Defendants admit, however, that Plaintiff had "pending certain patent applications respecting the use of TGF-a for treatment of central nervous system disorders and injuries..." at the time of their representation.
- 12. Defendants admit that "[i]n December 2005, Neurorepair's Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Matthew Klipstein ("Klipstein"), spoke to Cogan, who was then a member of the Nath Law Firm in its San Diego, California office, about the prospect of retaining Defendants, and each of them, to take over the prosecution of the Patent

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Applications."	Defendants deny the	remainder of the	allegations	contained in	n this
paragraph.					

- 13. Defendants admit the substance of the first two sentences of this paragraph. Defendants, however, deny the remainder of the allegations as they are ambiguous and proffer legal conclusions that can neither be admitted nor denied.
 - 14. Defendants deny these allegations.
 - Defendants deny these allegations. 15.
 - 16. Defendants deny these allegations.
- 17. This paragraph presents legal conclusions that cannot be admitted or denied. To the extent that this paragraph makes factual assertions, Defendants deny those assertions.
 - 18. Defendants deny these allegations.
- 19. Defendants deny the allegations contained in the first two sentences of this paragraph. Defendants also deny Plaintiff's characterization of Robert Cogan's email of January 1, 2007. Defendants do admit that Cogan stated in the foregoing email that "the billing practices to which you have been subjected are not acceptable." Mr. Cogan's remark, however, has been taken out of context by Plaintiff. To the extent that the remainder of this paragraph makes factual assertions, Defendants deny those assertions.
- 20. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and, on that basis, deny the allegations of this paragraph.
- 21. This paragraph presents legal conclusions that cannot be admitted or denied. To the extent that this paragraph makes factual assertions, Defendants deny those assertions.
- 22. Defendants admit that "on or about August 22, 2007, Neurorepair terminated its agreement with Defendants." Defendants deny the remainder of the allegations of this paragraph.
 - 23. Defendants deny these allegations.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

- 24. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses set forth in 1-23 supra.

 25. Defendants admit that they entered into an "atterney client relationship"
- 25. Defendants admit that they entered into an "attorney-client relationship" with Plaintiff. However, Defendants deny and object to Plaintiff's characterization of the attorney-client relationship "as described" in Plaintiff's complaint.
- 26. This paragraph presents legal conclusions that cannot be admitted or denied. To the extent that this paragraph makes factual assertions, Defendants deny those assertions.
 - 27. Defendants deny these allegations.
 - 28. Defendants deny these allegations.
 - 29. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses set forth in 1-28 supra.
- 30. This paragraph presents legal conclusions that cannot be admitted or denied. To the extent that this paragraph makes factual assertions or assertions contrary to law, Defendants deny those assertions.
 - 31. Defendants deny these allegations.
 - 32. Defendants deny these allegations.
 - 33. Defendants deny these allegations.
- 17 Defendants incorporate by reference their responses set forth in 1-33 supra.
 - 35. Defendants admit that they entered into a written agreement for the provision of legal services. However, Defendants deny and object to Plaintiff's characterization of such agreement "as described" in Plaintiff's complaint.
 - 36. Defendants deny these allegations.
 - 37. Defendants deny these allegations.
 - 38. Defendants deny these allegations.
 - 39. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses set forth in 1-38 supra.
- 25 Defendants deny these allegations.
 - 41. This paragraph presents legal conclusions that cannot be admitted or denied. To the extent that this paragraph makes factual assertions or assertions contrary to law, Defendants deny those assertions.

		Case 3:09-c	v-00986-JAH -WMC Document 7 Filed 05/27/09 Page 5 of 12			
	1	42.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
600 101	2	43.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	3	44.	Defendants incorporate by reference their responses set forth in 1-43 supra.			
	4	45.	This paragraph presents legal conclusions that cannot be admitted or			
	5	denied. To the extent that this paragraph makes factual assertions or assertions contrary to				
	6	law, Defendants deny those assertions.				
	7	46.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	8	47.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	9	48.	Defendants incorporate by reference their responses set forth in 1-47 supra.			
	10	49.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
, STE. IIA 92	11	50.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
ADWAY LIFORN	12	51.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
т Bro, io, Ca	13	52.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
501 West Broadway, Ste. 600 San Diego, California 92101	14	53.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	15	54.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	16	55.	Defendants incorporate by reference their responses set forth in 1-54 supra.			
	17	56.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	18	57.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	19	58.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	20	59.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	21	60.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	22	61.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	23	62.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	24	63.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	25	64.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	26	65.	Defendants deny these allegations.			
	27	///				
	28	///				

1 FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 2 (Statute of Frauds) 3 As a fifth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that Plaintiff's claims are barred by the Statute of Frauds. 4 5 SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 6 (Res Judicata/Collateral Estoppel) 7 As a sixth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that Plaintiff's 8 Complaint is barred by the doctrines of res judicata and/or collateral estoppel. 9 <u>SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u> KLINEDINST PC 501 WEST BROADWAY, STE. 600 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101 10 (Unclean Hands) As a seventh and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that by reason of its 11 12 conduct, Plaintiff is barred by the Doctrine of Unclean Hands from taking any relief 13 sought in the Complaint. 14 **EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE** 15 (Ripeness) 16 As an eighth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that Plaintiff has 17 not yet incurred damages or loss with respect to this action. The Complaint is therefore 18 not ripe for adjudication. 19 **NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE** 20 (Uncertainty) 21 As a ninth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that the causes of 22 action in said Complaint, and each of them, are uncertain and ambiguous as to Plaintiff's 23 claim for damages against Defendants. 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Laches)

As a tenth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that the causes of action contained in the Complaint, and each of them, are barred by the doctrine of laches, in that the Plaintiff has unreasonably delayed in bringing these claims, and said delays have prejudiced Defendants.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Defendant Exercised Reasonable Care)

As an eleventh and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that, at all times relevant herein, Defendants exercised reasonable care and did not know, and in the exercise of reasonable care could not have known, of the alleged acts or allegations in connection with the conditions which are the subject of the Complaint.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Assumption of Risk)

As a twelfth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that at all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff, with full knowledge of all risks attendant thereto, voluntarily and knowingly assumed any and all risks attendant upon his conduct, including any purported damages alleged to be related thereto and proximately caused thereby.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Intervening Acts of Others)

As a thirteenth and separate affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that the injuries and damages sustained by Plaintiff, if any, were proximately caused by the intervening and superseding actions of others, including Plaintiff's concurrent and/or successor counsel, which intervening and superseding actions bar and/or diminish Plaintiff's recovery, if any, against Defendant.

26 | ///

27 | ///

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Attorneys' Fees Inappropriate)

As a fourteenth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that the Complaint, and each and every cause of action listed therein, fails to state facts sufficient to support an award of damages for attorneys' fees, expert witness fees, and other litigation fees, costs, and expenses as against Defendants.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Speculation)

As a fifteenth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that the damages and theories of causation alleged in the Complaint are speculative and not subject to determination by a finder of fact.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Causation)

As a sixteenth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that Plaintiff has not suffered any damage or injury that was actually or proximately caused by any act or omission of any Defendant. Plaintiff cannot prove that a more favorable result would have been obtained had Defendants acted differently.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Non-Existent Obligations Not Contracted for and Outside Agreement)

As a seventeenth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that the Complaint asserts non-existent obligations which were not contracted for and outside of the agreement among the relevant person(s).

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Duty to Disclose)

As an eighteenth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that they did not have a duty to disclose the "facts" as alleged in the Complaint.

27 | ///

KLINEDINST PC 501 WEST BROADWAY, STE. 600 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Representations True)

As a nineteenth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that any statement or fact or opinion made by any Defendant was true, or if not true, was reasonably believed to be true at the time it was made.

TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Misrepresentation or Omission)

As a twentieth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that they did not make any of the misrepresentations or omissions alleged in the Complaint.

TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Materiality and Reliance)

As a twenty-first and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that any misrepresentation or omission alleged in the Complaint was immaterial and not reasonably or actually relied upon by Plaintiff.

TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Excuse)

As a twenty-second and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that if any contracts, obligations, or agreements as alleged in the Complaint have been entered into, any duty of performance by Defendants is excused by reason of failure of consideration, waiver, breach of condition precedent, breach by Plaintiff, impossibility of performance, prevention by Plaintiff, frustration of purpose and/or acceptance by Plaintiff.

TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Lack of Standing)

As a twenty-third and separate affirmative defense, the Complaint, and each and every purported claim contained therein, is barred by reason of the fact that Plaintiff lacks standing to bring this action.

27 | ///

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Indispensable parties)

As a twenty-fourth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that this action cannot proceed because Plaintiff has failed to join one or more indispensable parties.

TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Additional Defenses)

As a twenty-fifth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that they may have additional defenses that cannot be articulated due to Plaintiff's failure to particularize its claims, due to the fact that Defendants do not have copies of certain documents bearing on Plaintiff's claims and due to Plaintiff's failure to provide more specific information concerning the nature of the damage claims. Defendants therefore reserve the right to assert additional defenses upon further particularization of Plaintiff's claims, upon examination of the documents provided, upon discovery of further information concerning the alleged damage claims, and upon the development of other pertinent information.

TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Right to Amend Answer)

As a twenty-sixth and separate affirmative defense, Defendants reserve the right to amend their answer herein, including the addition of affirmative defenses after pleading and discovery in preparation for trial.

TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Set Off)

As a twenty-seventh and separate affirmative defense, Defendants allege that Plaintiff's damages, if any, are off-set by amounts that Plaintiff owes to Defendants for services rendered.

26 || ///

27 | ///

		Case 3:09-cv-00986-JAH -WMC D	ocument 7	Filed 05/27/09 Page 12 of 12				
	1	WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for judgment against Plaintiff as follows:						
	2	1. That Plaintiff take nothing by way of its action;						
	3	2. That Defendants be awarded costs of suit incurred herein; and						
	4	3. For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.						
	5	KLINEDINST PC						
	6							
	7							
	8	DATED: May 27, 2009	By:	/S/ Chandra E. Kiamilev HEATHER L. ROSING GREGOR A. HENSRUDE CHANDRA E. KIAMILEV				
	9							
600 101	10			Attorneys for Defendants THE NATH LAW GROUP, ROBERT P.				
KLINEDINST PC 501 WEST BROADWAY, STE. 600 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101	11	779284v1		COGAN				
INST P IDWAY, IFORN	12	779204VI						
(LINED FBROA O, CAI	13							
WEST	14							
501 SAN	15							
	16							
	17							
	18							
	19							
	20							
	21							
	22							
	23							
	24							
	25							
	26							
	27							
	28							
			- 12	-				

09 CV 986 IAH NLS